G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—22-7-14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1902-03
~~191~~.
(Murrai)

File No. 215

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

Month———————

SUBJECT.

Passing orders ~~etc~~ re
destruction of prickly bear bu
exists in the garden attached to th
Chamarajeswaraswami Temple
at Chamarajpet

PREVIOUS REFERENCES LATER REFERENCES

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICE NOTE.

SUBJECT:— Estimate for destroying the prickly pear in the temple garden at Chamarajanagar

LAST REFERENCE.

Letter No. 245 dated 14th March 1903 from the Dy Commissioner Mysore District.

The Dy Commr submits an estimate for Rs 118-10-4 for destroying the prickly pears existing in the garden appertaining to the Sri Chama rajeswaraswami Temple at Chamarajanagar. From the Surveyor's report it is observed that the garden

was once in a flourishing
state when it was in the
holding of one Abdul
Khader, but that after
his death, it is being
leased out to others for
a period of 5 or 10 years.
The Auditor is of opinion
that by this arrangement and owing to the prickly
the garden has not thriven
well and that therefore
it ought to be leased out
for ~~a further~~ more
advantageously to others
after destroying the thorny
& plants in the garden -
For this purpose he has
submitted the estimate
in question -

The points for consi-
deration are: —

Why

(i) Why the garden should not be leased out for a longer period if necessary - say a 10 years - on condition of improving the garden including the destroying of the prickly pears and other noxious plants

(ii) The garden is reported to have been in a very good condition while in the holding of Abdul Khader

On what condition had it been leased out to him and for what period and why should it not be leased out on the same conditions now

The Dy Commr

~~189~~ 1903

From M. Kantaraja Iyer B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner of
Mysore District.

To L. Ananthasami Rao Esqr B.C.S.
Deputy Secretary to the Govt.
of Mysore, Judicial Depart.

Dated

Despatched 16th March 1903

Received

General No. 2165
No.

GOVT. OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
23-3-03.
REG. No 778
MUSEUM BRANCH

23/3/03

Enclosure No. 3

Submitting the sanction
estimate for Rs. 118-10-4 for destroying
the prickly-pear which exists in the
garden attached to the Sri Channa
-rajeswara swami temple at Channa-rayan

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Mysore District
Mysore Residency &
Dated Mysore 14th March 1903

From

A. Ranganatha Rao Esquire BA
Deputy Commissioner of the
Mysore District

To

C. Hayavadana Rao Esquire BA
Deputy Secretary to the Government
Mysore

Sir,

I have the honor to submit herewith for sanction my cost make amounting to Rs 118-10 for destroying the prickly pear which exists in the garden known as "Badagina tota" attached to the Sri Chamarajeswara swami temple at Hunsur

The cost may be met from the sum of Rupees 42,718-4-4 at the credit of the temple fund.

The Amildar reports that owing to the existence of the prickly-pear in the field none come forward to take the land for higher gutta.

The vernacular papers relating with the Treasury Officer's yadi No. 189 dated 5th November 1902 accompany for reference and obliging return.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

A. Ranganatha Rao
for Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District

MUZRAI

189

From Dy
THE SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

To The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore Dt.

Dated ~~March~~ 1903
Despatched 4. April

Received

General No. 2057
Muzrai F. No 67-02

Enclosure No. 3

His Letter no 245 dated 14 March 1903 submitting for sanction an Estimate for Rs 118-10-4 for destroying the prickly-pear which exists in the garden attached to the Sri Chamarajeswara-Swami temple at Chamaraj-nagar.

Adverting to the above has the honor to enquire why the garden should not be leased out for a longer period if necessary say-10 years-on condition of the lessee improving the garden

~~by destroying~~ including the
by destroying the prickly
pears &ca -

2. - From the records received
with the above it is observed
that the garden was in a
good condition while it was in the
holding of Abdul Khader - The Dy Comm^r is requested
On what condition ~~had~~ to report -
it been leased out to him
and for what period and
why it should not be
leased out on the same
conditions now?

3. The Enclosures are
returned for reference
and re-submission -

By Order
Dy Secy
Mun: Dept

28/3/00